Introduction

[https://globalchallenges.org](https://globalchallenges.org/)

Today, mankind lives not only in national societies, but also in a global community. This means that the behavior and decisions of the inhabitants of nation states also impact the vital interests of inhabitants of other countries. Global warmingmay be the most obvious example: Greenhouse gas emissions in any particular country will have an impact on global climate change.

The world community is facing a number of major global challenges which have to be jointly managed by all countriesthrough increased co-operation and an increased understanding of our interconnectedness. Other than climate change, the major problems and risks are other large-scale environmental damage and politically motivated violence (war, civil war, terrorism, weapons of mass destruction). Other major problems faced are extreme poverty and rapid population growth.

Rapid population growth – the global population has quadrupled over the last 100 years (which is one of the main reasons for the problem we face today), and is expected to increase by another 50 percent by the year 2100 – exacerbates all these problems. Despite this, and despite the knowledge that there are not nearly enough resources on the planet for the entire population of Earth to enjoy the current Western standard of living, the issue is not on the political agenda.

In order to manage these challenges, we need effective ways of making collectively binding, long-term decisions that take into account the interests of all those affected, including future generations. The system currently in place to manage these issues – including the UN and the organizations connected with the UN – are, in their present form, not up to the task. Today, these challenges are responded to using yesterday’s tools – multilateral negotiations which are susceptible to short-term national interests. As a consequence, the necessary action is either not taken or is taken too late, while the problems and risks continue to grow.

The Global Challenges Foundation wants to challenge participants from all over the world to formulate alternatives to the present state of affairs – either by complementing, strengthening and revising the present UN system, or by proposing completely new forms of governance. The proposals should be drafted with the aim of identifying and, as far as possible, preventing or minimizing challenges of the kind mentioned above.

[

STATUS:

\* DRAFT - has to write stuff

\* REVIEW v1 - has to review content

\* REVIEW v... - has to review content by another person

\* PROOFREAD - has to proofread

\* DONE - don't touch anymore

]

# **Abstract [DRAFT]**

1000 words max

# **Description of the model [REVIEW v1]**

Task (5500 words max)

The participant must design a governance model able to effectively address the most pressing threats and risks to humanity. In other words, the task is not to come up with direct solutions to specific problems. Rather, it is to design a general model for decision-making, with the aim of generating such solutions and the ability to do so, and possessing the resources to effectively implement them.

The governance model must also be such that it can be implemented within the foreseeable future. This requires that it be acceptable to major states and the wider international community. A significant measure of civic acceptance is also required. This requirement eliminates models that rely on time-consuming and controversial changes in the political system of individual states, e.g. models that postulate that all states should be democracies.

Furthermore, the governance model must involve a minimum of limitations to the sovereignty of nation-states, meaning that it should involve only such limitations as are necessary to ensure that national decisions do not seriously harm the vital interests of inhabitants of other countries, or of humanity as a whole. In other words, decisions within the governance model must not deal with the internal affairs of individual states.

"No problem can be solved from the same level of consciousness that created it" by Albert Einstein.

Since the end of WW2, through Cold War, invention of Computer and the rise of Internet, the world has changed drastically - both the problems humanity face and actors that can act upon it. To understand the whole picture, it's time to look from a fresh perspective. Indeed, the current world order has been in place for more than 3 centuries, so it will be exciting to expose its status quo and work with it within next five thousand words. Lets start with generalization beyond current order, introduction of a new perspective, and describtion of the task within the new context. Then author will finally propose a new governmance model and finish with a roadmap that is executable by tomorrow.

## **From Westphalian to Neomedieval world order / Beyond International order [REVIEW v1]**

Target: 700 words

Lets open this chapter top down. According to Hedley Bull, World Order is characterized by patterns or dispositions of human activity that sustain the elementary or primary goals of social life among mankind as a whole, while International Order is order among states only. Over the last few centuries, international order was a good proxy for world order because a state was the predominant form of sovereign actors within the world community. Unfortunately -- or perhaps luckily -- there are a multitude of authors[1] that have written about a decline of the system of states for several decades, although there is disagreement on what will take its place. Nevertheless, as states decline, the well-studied international order is of little use for understanding the less-studied world order of today, let alone of the future. There are certainly a variety of guesses about what's coming next, and each of them have very different implications for the future, but that discussion is out of the scope of this paper. Therefore I will move on with the school of thought that sees our time as a transition into a new world order of durable chaos within the “Neomedieval order”, and why it was chosen. What we see today around is that states share the politics of the world order with a multitude of non-state actors: organizations including the United Nations, companies such as Apple, nonprofit groups like the Red Cross, and of course, a variety of drug cartels and terrorist organizations. Many of these nonstate actors wield power globally on a par with state actors, rendering the state-centric Westphalian order weak at best, if not imminently collapsing. If that is true, the current world order might best be described as neomedievalism: "a non-state-centric, multipolar international system of overlapping authorities and allegiances within the same territory".[2] For some, neomedievalism represents an alternative to the Westphalian order, as showed by Philip Cerny, Mark Duffield, Stephen Kobrin, Jörg Friedrichs, and others. This proposal builds upon this worldview.

Sean McFate in his book "Modern Mercenary" summarizes the importance of shifting the perspective on world affairs:

"Neomedievalism is important because it offers a conceptual lens for understanding the seemingly dissonant and chaotic world order emerging from the ashes of the Cold War that cannot be easily grasped past the conceptual blinders of state-centrism. Rather than rationalizing the paradox in conventional state-centric international relations theory, neomedievalism instead acknowledges the fundamental reorganization and redistribution of power in the system from state to nonstate actors. It embraces the fragmentation of sovereignty and seeks to reorient international relations ideas away from state-centrism and toward an unstructured system of overlapping authorities and allegiances to better comprehend world affairs."

Hedley Bull:

Modern states have been united in the belief that they are the principal actors in world politics and the chief bearers of rights and duties within it. The society of states has sought to ensure that it will remain the prevailing form of universal political organisation, in fact and in right.

[... summary of Modern Mercenary & its references ...]

In neomedievalism, independent political actors in world affairs are categorized in different types of Sovereign agents:

* states that are diverse in several dimensions: integrity (strong North Korea vs weak Somalia), demography (old Norway vs young Sri Lanka), political system, size, etc.
* international organizations "... allow states to pool their sovereignty and claim authority over individual member states for the greater good", but "some international organizations [have] sought to transform themselves from a world stage for international relations into an actor upon it", like The International Criminal Court.
* Non-government organizations (NGOs) "are international nonprofit groups that operate independently of governments to provide humanitarian services directly to people", like Red Cross. For example, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the R2P doctrine, and the ICC all claim universal jurisdiction alongside states, as did the medieval church, based on the commitment to the rights inherent in every human.
* Multinational corporations' "foremost allegiance is to their shareholders [..], and their chief concern is profit rather than king and country."
* Illicit groups such as global terrorists, insurgents, drug cartels, and international criminal organizations are a third type of transnational actor on the rise. Unlike terrorist groups, which are nominally motivated by ideology, international criminal organizations seek profits and resort to violence, are self-governing and operate in a borderless manner.

In addition, integrity (DEF: the state of being whole, entire, or undiminished) matters. For example ...

## **Defining beneficiaries of "General model for Decision-making". [REVIEW v1]**

Target: 500 words

Let's open with a brave statement that everyone could agree on: humanity should be the beneficiary. That statement involves a few tricks on which I would like to expand more.

### **1. In its width, there's no representative agent of whole humanity one could listen to or directly support.**

We do have many agents of one of five types discussed above, but none of them is humanity itself. In other words, humanity is not a agent per se. And we can't just pick and use a specific agent as a proxy for humanity, because that would be discriminating against population that the lucky agent doesn't represent. Here I see two strategies how to benefit humanity in such conditions:

1. Unite multiple agents so that sum of those agent's represented populations in total cover all humanity.
2. Give birth to a new agent type that directly represents most all humanity.

This proposal is about the #1 strategy.

Nevertheless, in context of emerging neomedievalism, the task is ambitious: to either improve an existing international organization like the UN to be effective over all types of agents, or to design a brand new entity that would be.

### **2. In its timelessness, not only living humans but also future generations should be considered.**

To continue on the above mentioned problem, there's also a part of humanity that is not born yet. Unfortunely they are the most discriminated "minorities" - what amount of waste and deffered problems current generation is leaving behind for them to deal with. Also future generations are less represented by before mentioned types of agents than current generations.

## **(Politics) Who is on the side with goal [REVIEW v1]**

Target: 700 words

axiom: most of states are interested to do something.

The first interesting conclusion from agent types is that only NGOs are directly and inheretly aligned with the given goal. Corporations and illicit groups are opponents, but states and international organizations are neutral.

* Illicit groups are organized similar to corporations and seeks either profits or ideological goals, but by dirty means and within illegal industries that are directly opposed to goals for humanity - human trafficing, heavy drug cartels, mafia and etc. Those are opponents.
* Corporations are primary profit-seekers, and thus logically would contribute to the only if that will increase their profits or at least won't harm it. Furthermore, these profits are distributed to special interests insteads of good for the whole humanity. Of course it would be easy to align goals with some of the corporations, but not all of them (for example try ending war without harming military industry, or slavery without harming human trafficing cartels), and lots of them are somewhere in the middle. Thus I would say that corporations aren't foes as long they don't hinder the given goals of humanity, but in the same time are not friends as their inherit motivation is not aligned with goals of humanity.
* NGOs are the best friends. First, they are driven by goals of humanity as a core principle, in their own way in their own discipline. Obviously they have income (as well material donations and voluntary work) and expenses as corporations do, but we may say that they commit all profits towards humanity. Understandably, their goals not always coincide with goals of nation-states or corporations - for example Red Cross provide healthcare to rebels in name of "Everyone has right to health" or internet activists makes freely available otherwise expensive scientific papers in name of "Information should be free". Obviously, there's a still ongoing discussion whenever that's legal (concept of nation-state) to aid enemy of nation-state, and the answer may vary from nation-state to nation-state. Or if that's legal to steal information to share it with humanity, or even if term "stealing" can be applied to information as nothing is lost in contrast to stealing resources. Also, even slavery once was legal. So let's assume that everything which advances goals of humanity and is in interests of nation-states will eventually be recognized as legal.
* States are interesting. Theoretically it is a form how population organizes itself and should be concerned only about internal affairs, external security and wellbeing of state (whatever it means), but practically in literature there's divergent thought of what nation-state is about. But in practice corruption, populism and lobbying of special interests are prevailing problems in states that question the basic assumption that it cares first for its population. The good news is that state's goals are not in conflict with goals of humanity, but the bad news is that humanity isn't first priority of states.
* International institutions have a clearly set formal that mostly is aligned or doesn't conflict with goals of humanity. Therefore internation institutions can be regarded as at least neutrals for the of humanity.

The resulting enduser of given goals is humanity itself, so results should be owned by humanity and actions should be accountable to humanity - this implies transparency, sharing and co-participation.

## **Decision-making process [REVIEW v1]**

Target: 1000 words

Finally its time to expand on the decision-making process itself. Naturally, it consists of proposing, discussion and decision phases, where each of them are facilited by agents participating in the process. While each agent internally is free to impose any governance model, the interaction between sovereign agents can be only democratic (otherwise they wouldn't be sovereign anymore). For that matter I propose to build upon Liquid Feedback system for proposition development and decision making. It has already done the heaving lifting of defining the processes that I will summarize in the next chapter. Liquid Feedback assumes one-agent-one-vote axiom as in great democracy, but I would like to relax that in order to harness ideas and contribution to discussions of questionable agents while limiting their impact on decision making. The overview of these modifications are laid out in second chapter, but the new rules of liquid voting power and their dynamics are described in the third chapter.

### **Proposition development process [REVIEW v1]**

Liquid Feedback recognizes drawbacks of current implementations, most notable being "loud minority" problem, "illusion of consensus" problem and "populism" problem. It proposes 4 step process that not only surpresses these problems, but also increases overall proposition quality also.

For proposition development Liquid Feedback has done a great work and there's nothing much to add or remove from. To learn more about it, please refer to their manual, as here will be a brief summary relavant for context of this essay.

Anyone can write a proposal to change anything within postulated domain. First step is to gain sufficient activity among vote-holders within a set timeframe in order to advance to next step, otherwise it is discarded early as irrelevant. This ensures that each proposal that passes first step is worth to discuss about. Another important factor is how proposals show up for platform users - they are presented as stream but smartly ordered. Please refer to manual for formulas, but the point is that its impossible to gain attention by "spamming" proposal multiple times by the same group, so that all vote-holders are represented more or less equally at the top. This solves "loud minority" problem here.

The second step is called discussion phase, the longest of all four steps. The original content of proposal becomes "alternitive #1 solution to problem X". During this step users are expected to comment on original proposal to solve the described problem, and the author of alternative #1 solution is expected to cooperate with others to improve its proposal. Obviously at some point disagreement will come and in that case anyone is free to take up iniative and create "alternative #2" solution under the same problem, which also receives comments and is improved alongside. Multiple alternatives are encouraged as that discovers various possible solutions. This phase gives time to problem and solutions to mature before next two voting phases. Another imprtant factor is that comments are upvotable and downvotable, but these votes are relative to user. From user perspective, only the votes of other users he follows himself are taken into account. That elegantly solves both "loud minority" and "populism" problems as lots of users whom no-one follows will have zero impact.

The third step is a verification yes/no vote for each initiative. During that time no alternative solution can be edited, but new ones (expectedly resurrection of old versions) can be added. This phase is to deny last second change abuses from authors as supporters need to verify them later and has a chance to resurrect older version of author. In case no alternative solution is verified then initiative closes here and doesn't make it to voting phase.

The fourth phase is preferential voting for the best initiative. All supporters can approve, abstrain or disapprove each alternative solution, and optionally rank them too. Then using Schulze method the best of alternatives or status quo wins. Schulze method has been chosen as it fullfills number of desired criterias (see Liquid Feedback paper for interesting details). Among other benefits It ensures that "tactical voting" is eliminated as much possible, so voters can focus on expressing their support instead of tactical considerations. For example, lots of similar suggestions don't hurt each other so initators are encouraged to express alternative solutions, or voting for probable minority doesn't waste your vote so all supporters are taken into account even if their first priority didn't succeed.

All together, the platform provides a equal ground for everyone to participate and get objective picture of current and past matters. Under assumption that participant uses the platform as primary source of information, it solves "populism" problem as there no way how to manipulate the content of platform in favor of special interests.

### **Participation and delegated voting [REVIEW v1]**

In Liquid Feedback there's one vote per participant and the delegated voting (a.k.a. proxy voting). Votes (or parts of them therefor) are owned by agent, but they can be or used by himself or delegated to other agent (a.k.a. copying other's vote). Delegation process is very liquid (thus the name of Liquid Feedback), it can be changed at any time, can be specified differently within different domains, and are automatically suspended when agent decided to vote himself in particular incentive. Although each agent owns X voting power, he may yield a lot more voting power due voluntary delegation by other agents. Gains from this just like with generic "division of labor". As delegator agent may not have expertise in some domains or resources and time in general to participate in each incentive, thus he has a option to delegate his votes to someone with common interests instead of not participating at all.

Vote splitting respects diverse internal affairs of agents. For example, president of a state can keep it for himself (as in monarchies), or evenly distribute within its population (as in democracies). The same for NGOs or any other agent - its up to them how to distribute the vote best. Wide distribution is welcome as it facilitates co-participation and therefore gives responsibility to humanity itself. Other than that it doesn't impact anything else much.

For global community with diverse and fluid amount of agents that has to be extended.

That should work great in closed communities that has centralized membership status, but in global community it doesn't stand true. Therefore for liquid inclusion process we allow registration of any participant, regardless that's a human or entity like NGO or corporation. Such self-registered participants won't own any votes and in combination with above mentioned measures against "loud minorities" they can't harm the system. But what they can do is participate in discussions, propose incentives and even vote in rare cases when someone with voting power has deleged it to them. That would allow any human to participate in humanity's affairs, ensuring the human right to speak and to be heard without undermining sovereignity of global community agents. Also, such mechanism will provide staging grounds where to look for potential new vote-eligible participants.

### **Dynamic voting power of participants [DRAFT]**

Also Liquid Feedback sticks to "one participant one vote" rule like democracies does, but I want to point out another difference in usage here. Liquid Feedback, as well democracies are designed to be consisted of humans only, implying that "participants" are all made of flesh-and-bones and are equal in rights and (at least some of) motivations. Also the question of "being the participant or not" is left out of scope. But when designing democratic process for global community we have various agent types (and frankly none of them is human) that inheretly are not equal in rights and motivations as discussed above, as well are made of diverse structures even within one agent type (i.e. state can be either democratic or monarchy). Despites we have clear criterias for inclusion of state and nevertheless their amount doesn't change often, it's not clear at all which international institutions, NGOs and corporations should be included, furthermore they rise and fall more frequently than states. I call static approach "one participant one vote" not applyable to this dynamic case.

Consequently, I propose to have dynamic voting power for participants.

First, As a starting point, I propose to give voting power to states only for historic reasons - they are the only ones having voting power currently and that will be least non-controversial at implementation stage. I think that taking all members of UN is a good starting point for states, but it gets complicated for NGOs, corporations and other entities. This model already adds a lot, and hopefully will shiftly enough converge away from statism as it born. For example, having the first bunch of iniciates about deciding whom of other agent types to include also. Nevertheless, this is a open question and a place for improvement.

Second, to become a vote-eligble participant there should be a consensus on that. Current platform serves good for these purposes, thus one of the categories within it will be to manage participant list. Just like with any initiative, there has to a initiator, which closely resemblers current way of how new states are recognized. The difference is that there's a possibilty to disapprove the initiative, and any entitity can be suggested to add as participant. But the vote threshhold for adding or removing entity from participant list should be asymetric in favor for adding new ones, for example quarter to add and two-thirds to remove. Once recongized, entity should enjoy its status safely as recongized member, similarly with states where its impossible to de-recognize a state after it has been recognized. The point is that we want many and diverse participants.

Third, each participant has his own voting power. I propose to distribute voting power based on contribution to incentives that are decided on within the platform. That would reward actually doing what's agreed on. Also, that proxies the logic of having a stake, because if one cares he contributes nevertheless, and after being recognized by others the ones who care get reward. And so the voting power will converge "talkers" that get empowered via delegation and "doers" that get empowered via distribution, leaving freeriders and saboteurs deprived of actual voting power. As everyone are free to read the platform at any moment and discuss incentives or execute results, platform still is democratic as everyone is free to strive to become either a talker or doer at any moment. I expect that in such platform agents will converge into contributing participants with influence and voting power and harmless bystander participants.

Let's discuss other alternative distributions. As discussed above, "one man one vote" isn't a good option as we have diverse participants, and frankly none of them men or women. Then voting power may be based on how much and at what quality you contribute in decision making process, but that's already done via delegated voting under assumption that such entities will get most of delegated votes. Another logic is to distribute based on how much stake each participant holds, but because our stake is such vague "humanity" and participant domains of participants nevertheless overlaps, it is impossible even to define measurement so that humanity (included those humans not born yet) are represented equally and fairly.

The challange comes at measuring what's done, and that can be measured in either objective or subjective way. I see it impossible to establish universal objective measure for such diverse and unique term "threats and risks to humanity". Therefore I suggest to use a "subjective" measurement where participants either rate or rank their peers. In both cases, the usual way of taking average value as truth criterion would be a disaster for various reasons and biases. To conter some biases and eliminate motivation for tactical voting (i.e. voting not for truth for own's good) let's employ Drazen Prelec's "Bayesian Truth Serum" method that bases on metaknowledge. It requires that "respondents provide their judgments and also their predictions of the distribution of judgments in a sample of peers", and the answer is average, but with high weights to those answers with accurate metaknowledge and low weights to those answers with bad metaknowledge. According to his paper, that is all what is needed to about both "rewarding truthfulness, and aggregating judgments to discover truth". Exactly what we need to to counter political games.

Bayesian Truth Serum method is applyable only to questions that can be formed with multi-choice answers. That restriction disallows us to use ranking of peers so we are left with rating of peers. Obviously we will rate the contribution of every peer from "nothing" to "exceptional", and research [4] shows that scales with up to 7 categories performs best. I am aware of importance for questinnaires phrasing, and this obviously is another place of improvement of this essay, but as the starters let me present an example question with answers see below.

Please rate member "X" contribution to implementation of decisions made within LiquidHumanity platform:

1. Extraordinary contribution.

2. High quality/amount of contribution that exceed above-the-average commitment.

3. Appropriate contribution that matches above-the-average commitment.

4. Appropriate contribution that matches commitment.

5. Some contribution but less than committed.

6. Put great effort but without appropriate contribution.

7. No effort nor usefull contribution.

The rating would proceed as follows. At regular intervals (i.e. 2 years), all participants come together to perform voting physically, or probably don't come together and does it digitally. Each participant answers the question and provides expected distribution of answers, for each peer. Then all the answers are proceeded according to Bayesian Truth Serum method (more details on this at implementation chapter below) to get a result - each participant has his category. Then, according to category is distributed voting power. For example, #1 category gets 100%, #2 - 80%, #3 - 60%, #4 - 45%, #5 - 30%, #6 - 15%, #7 - 5%. The exact mapping of category to voting power is open for improvements. Then for the next period, each participant owns a new amount of voting power.

Trustworthy and constructive agents are empowered via vote delegation, and effective decision implementators are empowered via vote distribution. Tactical saboteurs are recognized via transparency and remembered via history. That together should create virtious loop to empower collaborative agents and neutralize revealed selfish saboteurs.

#### **[Random phrases & ideas to this chapter]**

"The proposal is as follows: States, NGOs and Internation institutions come together "to the table of ABC". Corporations are ok to be around but doesn't have any formal voting power. The main idea is that NGOs do their calling for positive impact, states and other international institutions keep corporations in check to not commit negative impact, and everyone indirectly helps NGOs. Meanwhile ABC serves as a humanity's distributed platform for proposals, discussion and decision-making.""

## **Enforcement [DRAFT]**

Target: 500 words

For enforcement, I see 4 setups to organize enforcement:

1. each member holds power to harm/destroy other members and everyone is intimated to behave by collective threats to execute this power
2. there is special entity that holds the power mentioned above instead of each individual
3. there is some common good that is shared among members and everyone is intimated to behave by threats to be denied to this good
4. there is a straightforward public feedback on member actions and everyone is intimated to behave by peer pressure

For enforcement, I see that peer pressure mechanism emerges naturally by providing straightforward and public feedback on member actions via ranking discussed above. Like in old days with the race to the Moon, states are expected to compete with their rivals in the eyes of all the rest states.

We choose peer pressure

## **(Implementation) Required tools and technology [DRAFT]**

Target: 700 words

LiquidFeedback (re-implemented on blockchain)

Universal ID - humaniq.co - everyone needs bio ID to log into liquid feedback system.

Benevolent dictator for life

Cryptography to provide anonymity in voting

## **Roadmap [DRAFT]**

Target: 500 words

## **Example [DRAFT]**

Target: 300 words

# **How the model meets the assessment criteria [DRAFT]**

Assessment criteria (2750 words max) - Entries will be assessed based on how well they can be expected to manage global challenges and meet the criteria listed below:

... some intro words ...

### **Specific global challanges [DRAFT]**

Lets get more specific with global challanges... List of risks in order of importance [1]:

1. Risks from artificial intelligence
2. Promoting effective altruism
3. Global priorities research
4. Factory farming
5. Biosecurity
6. Nuclear security
7. Developing world health
8. Climate change (extreme risks)
9. Land use reform
10. Smoking in the developing world

UN Sustainable Development Goals[3]:

1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere
2. End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture
3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
4. Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all
5. Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls
6. Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all
7. Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all
8. Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all
9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation
10. Reduce inequality within and among countries
11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable
12. Ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns
13. Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts
14. Conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources for sustainable development
15. Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss
16. Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels
17. Strengthen the means of implementation and revitalize the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development

As we can see, these challanges are very diverse - they are both direct and meta problems, both external and internal to humanity, both old and new problems, both well-marketed and underexposed problems, as well they are ranging across variety of disciplines. ...

## **(1.) Core Values. [DRAFT]**

Decisions within the governance model must be guided by the good of all humankind and by respect for the equal value of all human beings.

## **(2.) Decision-Making Capacity. [DRAFT]**

Decision-making within the governance model must generally be possible without crippling delays that prevent the challenges from being adequately addressed (e.g. due to parties exercising powers of veto).

## **(3.) Effectiveness. [DRAFT]**

The governance model must be capable of handling the global challenges and risks and include means to ensure implementation of decisions.

## **(4.) Resources and Financing. [DRAFT]**

The governance model must have sufficient human and material resources at its disposal, and these resources must be financed in an equitable manner.

## **(5.) Trust and Insight. [DRAFT]**

The trust enjoyed by a successful governance model and its institutions relies on transparency and considerable insight into power structures and decision-making.

## **(6.) Flexibility. [DRAFT]**

In order to be able to fulfil its objectives effectively, a successful governance model must contain mechanisms that allow for revisions and improvements to be made to its structure and components.

## **(7.) Protection against the Abuse of Power. [DRAFT]**

A control system must be in place to take action if the organization should overstep its mandate, e.g. by unduly interfering with the internal affairs of nation-states or favouring the special interests of individuals, groups, organizations, states or groups of states.

## **(8.) Accountability. [DRAFT]**

It is a fundamental requirement of a successful governance model that it performs the tasks it has been charged with, and the governance model must include the power to hold the decision-makers accountable for their actions.

# **References [DRAFT]**

[1] Benjamin Todd, the CEO of 80,000 Hours, <https://80000hours.org/career-guide/world-problems/>

[2] The Modern Mercenary - Private Armies and What They Mean for World Order by Sean McFate

[3] <http://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/>

[4] Budescu, D. V., & Nevo, B. (1985). Optimal number of options: An investigation of the assumption of proportionality. Journal of Educational Measurement, 22(3), 183-196.

# **Attachments [DRAFT]**

max 2 illustrations

# **Apendixes (not to be submitted)**

## **Apendix 1**

Westphalian order, the current Global order, codified into International Law, is based on basic principle - states are the only sovereign agents in global politics. As long states are sovereign, and there are no other sovereign, Westphalian order is considered strong. Of course, states are allowed to come together and make international institutions, and make pledges or even surrend part of its sovereigncy to the international institutions, like Internation Criminal Court or United Nations itself. But in last decades Westphalian order has been weak and is slowly breaking down further due to many reasons:

1. **Takeover of International institutions** - blahblahblah
2. **Rise of corporations** - blahblahblah
3. **Downfall of state integrity** - blahblahblah
4. **Broken state's monopoly on military** - blahblahblah
5. **Birth of NGOs** - blahblahblah
6. **Unilateral interventions** - blahblahblah

## **Apendix 2: Hedlay Bull excerpts**

Hedlay Bull: To say of a number of things that together they display order is, in the simplest and most general sense of the term, to say that they are related to one another according to some pattern, that their relationship is not purely haphazard but contains some discernible principle.

Hedley Bull: First, all societies seek to ensure that life will be in some measure secure against violence resulting in death or bodily harm . Second, all societies seek to ensure that promises , once made, will be kept , or that agreemen ts, once undertaken , will be carried out . Third, all societies pursue the goal of ensuring that the possession of things will remain stable to some degree, and will not be subject to challenges that are constant and without limit.

Hedley Bull: States are independent political communities each of which possesses a government and asserts sovereignty in relation to a particular portion of the earth's surface and a particular segment of the human population. ... On the one hand, states assert, in relation to this territory and population, what may be called internal sover­eignty, which means supremacy over all other authorities within that territory and population. On the other hand, they assert what may be called external sovereignty, by which is meant not supremacy but independence of outside authorities.

Hedley Bull: A society of states (or international society) exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions. If states today form an international society (to what extent they do is the subject of the next chapter), this is because, recognising certain common interests and perhaps some common values, they regard themselves as bound by certain rules in their dealings with one another, such as that they should respect one another's claims to independence, that they should honour agreements into which they enter, and that they should be subject to certain limitations in exercising force against one another. At the same time they co­operate in the working of institutions such as the forms of procedures of international law, the machinery of diplomacy and general international organisation, and the customs and conven­tions of war.

Hedley Bull: First, there is the goal of preservation of the system and society of states itself. Modern states have been united in the belief that they are the principal actors in world politics and the chief bearers of rights and duties within it. Second, there is the goal of maintaining the independence or external sovereignty of individual states. From the perspective ofThe Concept of Order in any particular state what it chiefly hopes to gain from participation in the society of states is recognition of its independence of outside authority, and in particular of its supreme jurisdicti on over i ts subjects and territory. The chief price it has to pay for this is recognition of like rights to independ ence and sovereignty on the part of other states. Third, there is the goal of peace. By this is meant not the goal of establishing universal and permanent peace, [.. but] What states seek to make secure or safe is not merely peace, but their independence and the continued existence of the society of states itself which that independence requires. Fourth, it should be noted that among the elementary or primary goals of the society of states are those which, at the beginning of this chapter, were said to be the common goals of all social life: limitation of violence resulting in death or bodily harm, the keeping of promises and the stabilisation of possession by rules of property. The goal of limitation of violence is represented in international society in a number of ways. States co-operate in international society so as to maintain their monopoly of violence, and deny the right to employ it to other groups. The goal of the keeping of promises is represented in the principle 'pacta sunt ser vanda'. Among states as among individuals, co­operation can take place only on the basis of agreements, and agreements can fulfil their function in social life only on the basis of a presumption that once entered into they will be upheld. The goal of stability of possession is reflected in international society not only by the recognition by states of one another's property, but more fundamentally in the compact of mutual recognition of sovereignty, in which states accept one another's spheres of jurisdiction: indeed, the idea of the sovereign ty of the state derived historically from the idea that certain territories and peoples were the property or patrimony of the ruler.

Hedley Bull: 'Supra-state' actors such as, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the Papacy and the Holy Roman Emperor, or, in the twentieth century, the United Nations (one thinks especially of its role as a violent actor in the 1 960- 1 Congo crisis) present such a threat. 'Sub-state' actors which operate in world politics from within a particular state, or 'trans-state' actors which are groups cutting across the boundaries of states, may also challenge the privileged position of states in world politics, or their right to enjoy it; in the history of modern international society the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary manifestations of human solidarity engen­dered by the Reformation, the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution are principal examples.